REMARKS

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 11, 13, 15, 17 and 19 remain pending.

Claims 11, 13, 15, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by SenseMaker: An Information-Exploration Interface Supporting the Contextual Evolution of a User's Interests, Baldonado et al. (Baldonado). The Applicants traverse these rejections as follows.

The Applicants note at the outset that independent claims 11 and 15 have been amended to revert to previously-submitted language regarding the second search. Apparently, Baldonado was cited with regard to a keyword correspondence between the independent claims and Baldonado with respect to the term expanding. However, the expansion disclosed by Baldonado is not coincident with the second search claimed by the present Applicants. Accordingly, the Applicants believe that the amended versions of the claims more clearly distinguish Baldonado.

The Applicants also submit that the independent claims distinguish Baldonado in regard to the first and second searches performed according to the claims, and in particular the second search which is of a second document database which differs from the first document database, and is performed using at least one term selected from a weighted term list made from at least one document inputted as a result of a first search of the first document database. Then, as set forth in claim 11, at least one document from the second document database is retrieved as a result of the second search, a second weight of each term used as the second search input is calculated, wherein the second weight reflects the importance of each term to each document retrieved from the second document database by the second search, the

relevance of each document retrieved from the second document database is found by calculating an overall weight on both the weighted term list and the calculated second weights for each document with respect to terms common in both, when the results are displayed.

Baldonado, on the other hand, discloses a quite conventional scheme for performing multiple searches using multiple search services and, optionally, multiple databases. The SenseMaker usage scenario is set forth in the second through fourth (unnumbered) pages thereof, and describes a user "Karen" who provides a keyword query *java interface* to a heterogeneous set of search services. The search collects a number of documents that match the query, and groups the results in bundles defined by article source. Viewing the bundles, Karen chooses two, and resubmits the same query to the domains sun.com and javasoft.com that proved to have bundled results that were the most interesting to her.

Upon receiving a new collection of results from this second search of these already-searched databases, Karen returns to the collection bundles and chooses only the sun.com bundle. She then creates a new query *java security* and repeats the previous search using the new query term. The newly-created collection has both the old sun.com and the new *java security* results, and from these she re-bundles and then chooses a new bundle from princeton.edu. Thus ends Karen's search.

It is evident that, while Karen's search encompassed several databases, there was no instance of conducting a first search of a first document database based on a first search input; retrieving at least one document from the first document database as a result of the first search; and conducting a second search of a second

8

document database which differs from the first document database using a term selected from a weighted term list resulting from the first search as the second search input, as required by each of the independent claims. Karen's search also did not retrieve at least one document from the second document database; calculate a second weight of each term used as the second search input, which reflects the importance of each term to each document retrieved from the second document database; and find out the relevance of each document retrieved by the second search by calculating an overall weight on both the weighted term list and the calculated second weights for each document with respect to terms common in both, as required by claim 11. The claimed service is entirely different from Baldonado, and only shares the common features of performing multiple searches using multiple databases. Baldonado discloses no weighting, no generation of terms, no weighting of said terms; does not employ the results of the first search in generating the results of the second search; and does not calculate an overall weight of terms using representing results of both searches in order to determine the relevance of all documents retrieved from the second search. Baldonado also does not consider, in any way, the importance of terms that are common to both search results.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

      To the extent necessary, the Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Brundidge & Stanger, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-4888 (referencing attorney docket no. NIT-163-02).

                    Respectfully submitted,

                    BRUNDIDGE & STANGER, P.C.

                    _____/Daniel J. Stanger/_____
                    Daniel J. Stanger
                    Registration No. 32,846

DJS/sdb
(703) 684-1470